

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 45 are in the application, with Claims 1, 5, 17, 28 and 37 having been amended. Claims 1, 5, 17, 28 and 37 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims Rejections Under 35 USC § 112, 1st Paragraph

Claims 3-4 are rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

To overcome this rejection, a paragraph has been added to the specification, as indicated above, to include in the specification the subject matter recited in claims 3 and 4. It is not believed that this amendment to the specification introduces new matter into the application, since claims 3 and 4 were present in the application as originally filed, and thus the application as originally filed disclosed the subject matter now added to the specification.

It is accordingly requested that the rejection of claims 3 and 4 under § 112, first paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

It is noted that the pending Office Action did not state any prior art rejection of claims 3 and 4, and it is therefore submitted that claims 3 and 4 recite allowable subject matter.

Claims Rejections Under 35 USC § 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claim 1 is rejected as being indefinite.

It is believed that this rejection has been overcome, since claim 1 has now been amended to comport with the Examiner's interpretation thereof.

Claims Rejections Under 35 USC § 102(e)

Claims 1-2 and 28 are rejected as being anticipated by Flanagan et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,243,737 ("Flanagan").

Applicant will again open by noting that claims 1 and 28 are concerned with detecting flaws in a computer program by analyzing the program prior to runtime. By contrast, the Flanagan reference is mainly concerned with behavior of a computer program during runtime. Flanagan does not teach analyzing a program prior to runtime to determine whether the program

will execute properly. Claims 1 and 28 have now been clarifyingly amended to more sharply recite this distinction relative to the Flanagan reference.

As now presented, claim 1 is directed to a “method in a computer system for determining resolution of attributes of a program”. The claimed method includes “analyzing said program prior to runtime”. The analyzing prior to runtime includes “providing said program having interactions, each interaction having commands with attributes” The analyzing prior to runtime further includes “identifying prior to runtime a sequence of interactions of the program”. Still further, the following are performed, as part of the analyzing prior to runtime, for each input attribute of each command of each interaction of the identified sequence of interactions: “identifying prior to runtime an output attribute corresponding to the input attribute” and “indicating prior to runtime that the input attribute is resolved if the identified output attribute has been indicated as resolved, and indicating prior to runtime that the input attribute is not resolved if the identified output attribute has not been indicated as resolved”. Also, the analyzing prior to runtime includes, “for each output attribute of the command, indicating prior to runtime that the output attribute is resolved”.

In pointing out the distinctions between claim 1 and the teachings of the Flanagan reference, applicant will now particularly focus on the following two claimed aspects of the analyzing prior to runtime:

- (a) “indicating prior to runtime that the input attribute is resolved if the identified output attribute has been indicated as resolved”; and
- (b) “indicating prior to runtime that the input attribute is not resolved if the identified output attribute has not been indicated as resolved”.

In explaining the rejection of claim 1 with respect to the limitation stated at paragraph (a) just above, the Examiner referred to two passages in Flanagan, namely column 2, lines 19-26; and column 17, lines 11-19. However, these passages fail to teach the limitation stated at paragraph (a) just above, at least as that limitation is now presented.

The passage at column 2, lines 19-26 only states, in regard to resolving input fields, that the input fields are resolved to addressable references according to a mapping. This passage does not state that input attributes are indicated as being resolved if an output attribute that corresponds to the input attribute is resolved.

The passage at column 17, lines 11-19 also does not satisfy the limitation stated at paragraph (a), because the passage at column 17, lines 11-19 discusses activity of the program during runtime, not prior to runtime as now clearly recited in the claim limitation. In this regard, it is noted that the passage at column 17, lines 11-19 is a discussion of blocks 224 and 228 in FIG. 14. FIG. 14 is an illustration of block 210 in FIG. 13 (see column 16, lines 61-62). FIG. 13, in turn, is an illustration of runtime transaction module 48 and block 182 of FIG. 12 (see column 15, line 66 to column 16, line 1). It will be noted from FIG. 12 that block 182 immediately follows block 181: "START RUN-TIME". Thus all of FIGS. 13 and 14 and the accompanying discussion, including the passage at column 17, lines 11-19, are concerned with operation of the program during runtime, not analyzing the program prior to runtime, nor indicating prior to runtime that an input attribute is resolved, as recited in claim 1.

In regard to the limitation of claim 1 stated in paragraph (b) above, the Examiner particularly relied upon passages at column 17, lines 50-57 and column 18, lines 23-29 of the Flanagan reference. However, these passages do not support the Examiner's reliance thereon. Also, these passages describe program activity during runtime, not analyzing a program prior to runtime, as now clearly recited in the limitation stated at paragraph (b) above.

These two passages of the Flanagan reference both describe aspects of FIG. 15, which is an illustration of block 190 in FIG. 12, and thus clearly relates to runtime execution of Flanagan's program.

Further, the passage at column 17, lines 50-57 describes copying a client transaction template so that the host input and output fields of the client transaction and the host transaction do not need to be resolved again. This is different from indicating that an input attribute is not resolved if the corresponding output attribute has not been resolved, as recited in the limitation stated in paragraph (b) above.

Also, the passage at column 18, lines 23-29 refers to checking that client output fields are resolved to host output fields. There is nothing in this passage about indicating that an input attribute is not resolved.

For at least the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the Flanagan reference.

Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 and is therefore believed to be allowable on the same basis as claim 1. In addition, claim 2 is believed to be allowable on grounds independent of the allowability of claim 1.

Claim 2 adds the limitation of reporting input attributes whose resolution is set to unresolved. In discussing claim 2 in the present Office Action, the Examiner referred to a passage at column 21, lines 42-60 of the Flanagan reference. The Examiner asserted that “the host transaction is failed if all the input and corresponding output has not [been] received (i.e. input attribute is not resolved)”. However, the cited passage in the reference does not support the Examiner’s reliance thereon. The passage discusses errors and failures in general terms, but does not at all refer to input attributes or fields, and certainly does not teach reporting input attributes that are not resolved.

Claim 28, as now presented, recites the following in addition to other limitations: “indicating prior to runtime that the output parameter is resolved”. In discussing this limitation in the pending Office Action, the Examiner referred to passages in Flanagan at column 18, line 5-10 and 23-29; and column 17, lines 10-20. However, all of these passages are descriptions of flow chart blocks that clearly represent activities performed during runtime, not “prior to runtime”, as now explicitly recited in this limitation.

Further with regard to claim 28, there is the limitation that “output parameters are sources of input parameters”. In the corresponding portion of the pending Office Action, the Examiner cited a passage at column 18, lines 6-10 to the effect that “host input fields generate host output fields.” However, this is exactly the opposite of the claim limitation, which specifies that output attributes are sources of input attributes.

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 28, at least as now presented, is clearly allowable over the Flanagan reference.

Claims Rejections Under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 5-8, 11-20, 22-27, 29-31, 33-41, 43-45 are rejected as being unpatentable over Flanagan ‘737 and further in view of Barritz et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,519,766 (“Barritz”).

Claims 9, 21, 32, and 42 are rejected as being unpatentable over Flanagan ‘737 and further in view of Barritz et al. ‘766, and Lindsay et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,754,670 (“Lindsay”).

Claim 10 is rejected as being unpatentable over Flanagan '737 and further in view of Barritz et al. '766, Lindsay et al. '670 and official notice taken by the examiner.

Claims 5, 17 and 37 have all been clarifyingly amended to recite that specific functions recited therein are performed before executing the program or prior to runtime. Consequently, those functions are not taught by the passages in Flanagan, primarily relied upon by the Examiner, in which functions performed during execution of the program are described. Again, in general terms, Flanagan fails to teach analysis of a program before execution of the program, and more specifically fails to teach indicating resolution of input or output attributes before execution of a program. The secondary references relied upon by the Examiner do not compensate for these deficiencies of the Flanagan reference. It is therefore submitted that claims 5, 17 and 37 are allowable for substantially similar reasons to those discussed above in connection with claims 1 and 28.

All claims other than claims 1, 5, 17, 28 and 37 are dependent claims that are submitted as patentable on the same basis as their parent independent claims. It is not believed that the other rejections under § 103 present any issues that require further discussion.

C O N C L U S I O N

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-3460.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel Levin
Registration No. 34,860
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Five Elm Street
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-3460

May 18, 2005

Date